



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/815,454	03/22/2001	Viyyokaran Raman Ramachandran	6647-20	7637

7590 09/08/2004
MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205

EXAMINER

JUNG, DAVID YIUK

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2134

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/815,454	Applicant(s) RAMACHANDRAN	
	Examiner David Y Jung	Art Unit 2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

CLAIMS PRESENTED

Claims 1-46 are presented.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Windows (www.comptechdoc.org/os/windows/win2k/win2kauthentication.html).

Regarding claim 1, Windows teaches "A cross-domain authentication apparatus, the apparatus comprising:

a first computer and a second computer; a network connecting the first and second computers (Windows 2000, which is an operating system over a such a networked computers) ;

a secret shared between the first and second computers (section "Process of Logging On", i.e. password for domain logon); and

a ... access policy identifying access permission on the first computer for a user local to the second computer over the network (section "Process of Logging On", i.e.

Art Unit: 2134

domain controller and the access policies such as the policy regarding checks and tickets).”

These passages of Windows do not teach “federated” in the sense of the claim.

Nevertheless, it was well known in the art to have a “federated” situation among multiple computers that are networked and controlled with domain controllers – especially in domain controllers that have group policy information which is replicated to all domain controllers, such as in Windows 2000 SYSVOL that is noted at the last sentence of the Windows reference – for the motivation of having easier control of a group of domain controllers.

Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to modify Windows for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 2 (reverse proxy, etc.), such particular features are well known in the art for the purpose of handling information across computers.

Regarding claim 3 (forward proxy, etc.), such particular features are well known in the art for the purpose of handling information across computers. Regarding claims 4-18, such particular features are well known in the art for the purpose of handling information across computers.

Regarding claim 19, Windows teaches “A method for performing cross domain authentication, the method comprising:

receiving a request for a ... on a first computer from a user local to a second computer over a network; challenging the user to be authenticated (section "Process of Logging On", i.e. password for domain logion);

authenticating the user; informing the first computer that the user is authenticated; and accessing the ... from the first computer using the second computer. network (section "Process of Logging On", i.e. domain controller and the access policies such as the policy regarding checks and tickets)."

These passages of Windows do not teach "resource" in the sense of the claim.

Nevertheless, it was well known in the art to have a "resource" situation among multiple computers that are networked and controlled with domain controllers – especially in domain controllers that have group policy information which is replicated to all domain controllers, such as in Windows 2000 SYSVOL that is noted at the last sentence of the Windows reference – for the motivation of having easier control of a group of domain controllers.

Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to modify Windows for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 20 (second computer authentication, etc.), claim 21 (returning authentication, etc.) such particular features are well known in the art for the purpose of handling information across computers.

Regarding claim 22 (proxy, etc.), such particular features are well known in the art for the purpose of handling information across computers. Regarding claims 23-46,

Art Unit: 2134

such particular features are well known in the art for the purpose of handling information across computers.

Conclusion

The art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The art disclosed general background.

Points of Contact

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 746-5606 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Application/Control Number: 09/815,454
Art Unit: 2134

Page 6

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to David Jung whose telephone number is (703) 308-5262
or Greg Morse whose telephone number is (703) 308-4789.

David Jung

Patent Examiner

2004-09-07

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'D' followed by a series of loops and a long horizontal stroke.